

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Claims 11-47 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 11-28 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 29-47 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

The title is amended to more accurately name the claimed invention. The abstract is amended to more accurately summarize the claimed invention. The drawings are amended to more clearly depict the claimed invention by the submission of one copy of 7 sheet(s) of substitute formal drawings attached hereto.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Bower. The disclosure of the Bower reference is not sufficient to support this rejection. This rejection is untenable.

Referring to column 4, lines 23-35 of the Bower reference (cited in the Office Action), although Bower teaches depositing nanotubes in a magnetic or electric field, Bower does NOT disclose or suggest the claimed protruding electrode. Referring to column 6, lines 48-60 of the Bower reference (cited in the Action) although Bower teaches depositing amorphous carbon, Bower does NOT disclose or suggest the claimed limitation of forming an elongated nanostructure proximate the edge of the protruding section of the electrode. Referring to column 4, lines 23-35 and column 8, lines 40-51 of the Bower reference (cited in the Office Action) although Bower teaches depositing nanotubes in a magnetic or electric field and applying an electric field perpendicular to the substrate surface, Bower does NOT disclose or suggest the claimed limitation of a tangent to the elongated nanostructure substantially non-parallel to a normal defined by the surface of the substrate. The recited limitation "non-parallel to a normal defined by the surface of the substrate" means non-perpendicular. In fact, every single

respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned (at direct line 512-394-0118) for prompt action in the event any issues remain that prevent the allowance of any pending claims.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a) pertaining to patent application processing fees, Applicant requests an extension of time from December 22, 2004 to March 22, 2005 in which to respond to the Office Action dated September 22, 2004. A notification of extension of time is filed herewith.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3204 of John Bruckner PC.

Respectfully submitted,

John Bruckner PC
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

John J. Bruckner
Reg. No. 35,816

Dated: Mar 22, '05

5708 Back Bay Lane
Austin, TX 78739-1723
Tel. (512) 394-0118
Fax. (512) 394-0119

embodiment of Bower teaches the axes of the nanotubes to be perpendicular to Bower substrate and, therefore, Bower teaches away from the claimed invention. For instance, the x-ray diffraction data presented in Fig. 8B of Bower proves that the Bower nanotubes are perpendicular to the Bower substrate.

The presently claimed invention is not disclosed or suggested by Bower because the Bower reference does not describe or teach 1) a protruding electrode, 2) forming an elongated nanostructure proximate the edge of the protruding section of the electrode or 3) a tangent to the elongated nanostructure substantially non-parallel to a normal defined by the surface of the substrate.

With regard to claims 7-9, each of these dependent claims add specific limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by the Bower reference. Referring to column 8, lines 20-401 of the Bower reference (cited in the Office Action) although Bower teaches applying an electric field perpendicular to the substrate surface, Bower does NOT disclose or suggest the claimed limitations of i) changing the direction of the electric field, ii) moving a protruding part of the electrode relative to a nonprotruding part of the electrode, or iii) moving the substrate relative to an edge of a protruding section of an electrode. With regard to claim 7, Bower does not even hint at changing the direction of the applied electric field. With regard to claim 8, Bower does not even hint at moving a protruding part of the electrode relative to a nonprotruding part of the electrode. With regard to claim 9, Bower does not even hint at moving the substrate relative to an edge of a protruding section of an electrode. Thus, these dependent claims are each considered to be separately patentable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or combination thereof in the Office Action. In view of the above, all the claims are considered patentable and allowance of all the claims is

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please substitute the attached Replacement Sheet(s) for its(their) corresponding drawing sheet(s) in this Application.